HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 29 Saturday, July 20, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

ZHUKOV AND IKE: *Summit reunion?* (page 1)
HIGH COURT: *Byrd vs. Warren* (page 1)
NUCLEAR NONSENSE: *Wasteful atoms* (page 3)
Backwash from Pugwash (page 2)
REUTHER: *Defeat in California* (page 4)

The Great Cover-Up: What tries the souls of conservative legislators these days is the avalanche of stereotyped "liberal" propaganda which envelops Congress. This propaganda, they perceive, is designed to conceal — on one pious pretext or another — dangerous mistakes of policy by the Government. Here follows a summary of the comments of these members of Congress about what they call the "cover-up" on many issues:

● The current, soothing line of the "liberal" editorialists and their likes on the subject of the Supreme Court is: keep cool; be respectful; don't heckle; it's the law now and permanent; *etc., etc.* This does not go down, on the right side of the aisle. Yesterday, we surprised a member, a Republican at that, who was composing an eloquent attack on what he called the "Warren Court."

The boys in the cloakrooms like to repeat the following story: A judge on the bench was once provoked to say to the famous lawyer, Clarence Darrow: "I hope you will not show contempt of the Court." Darrow retorted: "Your honor can always hope" — and proceeded to get himself cited.

● The aggressive speech by Senator Harry Byrd (D.-Va.) arraigning the Supreme Court and Chief Justice Warren, pierces the "cover-up" of the High Bench and opens the way to similar straight-from-the-shoulder attacks — say impartial observers who have studied the text of the debate. They make the following points:

(1) Never in history has any member of Congress so scathingly attacked a Chief Justice of the United States.

(2) What Byrd said will make a deep impression throughout the country, for the Senator from Virginia is the one Southern figure who enjoys a large following in the North.

(3) His strong words command attention, as the Senator is no "hothead," but has a reputation for speaking only after careful consideration.

(4) Byrd knows what he is doing, and the nature of his address suggests that there are under way proposals for stiff legislation which would curb the current legislative pretensions of the Court.

● Still another aspect of "Operation Smokescreen" is the failure of the press to dig into what is termed "The Judge Burnita Matthews case." For it was a 1955 ruling by Judge Matthews which forced the State Department to issue a passport to Jane Foster Zlatovski — indicted by a Federal grand jury in New York, July 8, on charges of spying for Communist Russia. State had previously refused to renew Mrs. Zlatovski's passport.

The result of Judge Matthews' decree was that Mrs. Zlatovski — in spite of the adverse file compiled on her by the FBI — was able to leave the United States. She and her husband now rest, apparently safe from extradition, in their Parisian "privileged sanctuary."

● Members of Congress gloomily say that Ike's suggestion for a meeting between Zhukov and Wilson is simply a part of a buildup for a conference between the Russian Marshal and Ike himself. They recall that Eisenhower fell into a Zhukov trap in 1945 when he talked with the Russian and thought he had obtained a firm agreement for a free corridor into Berlin. He failed to get it on paper. Three years later, the Russians sealed the old German capital and we were forced into the airlift operation to save Berlin.

● "Controlled press" — that term increasingly appears in the conversation of members complaining of the almost daily "cover-up." They probably have in mind the Washington situation, particularly in the years since the Chicago *Tribune*-owned *Times-Herald* was absorbed by the "liberal" *Post;* and the other local papers are not satisfactory to the conservatives.

Members recently used the term in connection with a rumor that Eastern newspaper tycoons are seeking to buy *The Kansas City Star.* Roy Roberts, the publisher, is aging and some stockholders reportedly might want a deal. In such an event, it was pointed out, a "press lord" in the East would control what has been a very independent newspaper. "Press lords," it was remarked, like to get invited to lunch at the White House; then they accommodatingly adjust their policy to that of the Palace Guard. In all likelihood, more will be heard about this topic.

● Like all "liberal" Democrats, Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana continues to do the work of the appeasers; he performed this mission in a speech last week, urging that Secretary Dulles visit the capitals behind the Iron Curtain. This suggestion was imbedded in long exhortations to be brave and tough with Moscow, and the speech enjoyed a great buildup in "liberal" and other papers. Dulles dismissed the idea promptly, without comment.

Right-wingers say the Mansfield proposal would actually strengthen the position of the Kremlin. They quote Constantin Fotich, former Ambassador from Yugoslavia, now and for many years known around Washington as an authority on Eastern Europe. Fotich says: "If Dulles went to those capitals, his calls on the satellite dictators would discourage the forces of resistance to communism in those countries. The people would say that the U.S. had sold them out again."

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shouts and Murmurs: Ike is blamed for acts of which he's quite innocent, while he goes scot free for other deeds for which he should be rebuked — so runs one Capitol Hill refrain. For instance, Ike sent out secretly that directive (see last week's issue) to all departments and agencies, aiming at a cutback in '58 spending of an estimated $2 billion. Yet, the hypocritically "economy-minded" Democratic leaders unjustly accused the President of playing politics, of slyly seeking a tax cut.

On the other hand, Ike took an expensive step in the opposite direction when he signed the omnibus housing bill (passed by grace of the self-styled economy-minded Democratic leadership), cost of which runs to about $1.74 billion. Ike coughed hard and expressed criticism of the measure but signed nevertheless. Real economy advocates have pointed out the fiscal unsoundness as well as inflationary repercussions of this bill. The President, they say, should have vetoed it. If he had, members of Congress emphasize, the Congress would not have passed it over his veto.

● But the battle for economy still hangs in the balance. Various moves in the House (too complicated and tentative to be analyzed here) indicate that the spirit for Budget reduction remains strong.

Representative Lawrence Smith's sharp criticism of the foreign aid "development" fund ("I shall never vote to surrender control over appropriations in such reckless fashion"), as well as his stern warning that spenders invite retaliation from their constituents, had a visible effect on his colleagues. Representative H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa) labelled the same measure a "brand new strip-tease act" giving the President "unthinkable power." Indications are that the Appropriations Committee (the next step) will not prove generous.

● Senatorial GOP colleagues who are boosters of Minority Leader Knowland express concern these days. They fear that Knowland's handling of the "civil rights" legislation has hurt him among long-time supporters. They themselves still stand by him. They understand the significance of various complicated maneuvers guided by Knowland (which the public cannot grasp), and the necessity for their party's leader to play ball to a certain extent with the head of the party in the White House. (On some things, however, they think he's just plain wrong.) Still, knowing how these matters emerge only partially reported in the press, they can't blame Knowland's erstwhile friends, now critics.

What they fear most is that the Californian is losing a good deal of his right-wing support, which he will need in his expected upcoming race for the Governorship of his state. They say Knowland should heed Taft's dictum (which, it is true, Taft himself did not always follow) that a Republican should seek to bring out and retain right-wingers who have been sitting on their hands rather than court "liberal" votes. All in all, they ardently wish Knowland were not Senator but Governor, in safe Sacramento where he would not have to take stands on any and all contentious and dangerous national issues. The Senate, it is often said (and particularly about Taft), is the cemetery of Presidential hopefuls.

Disarmament: As Harold Stassen's London "disarmament" conferences wore on without result last week, a group of American scientists journeyed to Pugwash, Nova Scotia, to participate in an international thinkfest on atomic energy. Among the nine other nations represented at the meeting: Red China and the Soviet Union.

The meeting, convoked by England's fellow-travelling Earl Bertrand Russell and sponsored by financier Cyrus Eaton, has raised some eyebrows in the Capital. Such north-of-the-border hobnobbing of American nuclear scientists with Communists, it is said, raises serious questions of security and survival. (U.S. citizens travelling to Canada do not need passports.)

Amid the usual swirl of warnings about "nuclear annihilation," however, the Pugwash scientists did produce one unexpected conclusion about atomic disarmament: "a completely effective and reliable control system appears to be no longer possible."

Since inspection and control are the announced prerequisites of any "disarmament" agreement by the U.S., this statement — say students of our atom policy — should put an effective end to the belief that we can deal with the Communists by throwing down our weapons.

Meanwhile, other strong opposition has come to bear on our wistful quest for disarmament. During the past week, a brilliant speech by G. F. Hudson, Director of Far Eastern Studies at Oxford University, drew the attention of the American press. Addressing a meeting of the Congress for Cultural Freedom in England last month, Hudson characterized the "disarmament" talks as aiding the Soviets and hurting the West.

Noting the massive Soviet commitment to "conventional" (non-atomic) forces, the Oxford scholar stated (as quoted in *U. S. News and World Report* for July 19): "Even though the West has a sound case in refusing to abolish nuclear weapons without a knaveproof system of inspection and control, it is becoming more and more obvious that it cannot in any case agree to a prohibition of these weapons, because renunciation of them would leave Russia with an overwhelming preponderance of power."

Status of Forces: The Supreme Court's decision in the Girard case, analysts agree, has cleared the tracks for resumption of the suspected "deal" between Washington and Tokyo. This stratagem (momentarily derailed by the surprise ruling of Federal Judge Joseph C. McGarraghy) was first outlined in HUMAN EVENTS for June 8, 1957: "Girard is surrendered to appease anti-American sentiment in Japan . . .; then, the Japanese authorities try him and let him off with a 'suspended' sentence. This outcome can then be broadcast around the United States as 'proof' of the 'fairness' of the Status of Forces treaties."

Now, as "liberal" commentators try to stem the tide of indignation at the Supreme Court, and to prepare public opinion for Girard's trial next month, the outlines of this strategy begin to assume more definite shape. Secretaries Wilson and Dulles, in concluding the joint statement which the Supreme Court appended to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decision, stated that "there is every reason to believe that trial of . . . Girard in the Japanese courts will be conducted with the utmost fairness." Now dispatches from Tokyo sound a similar note.

This play on the "soft handling" of Girard, say students of the "Status of Forces" question, is merely a variation of the line long espoused by defenders of the agreements. "Status of Forces" partisans have repeatedly argued that — because our GI's allegedly receive light sentences from foreign courts — we are getting a "good deal" from the agreements. A recent example of this argument appeared in the left-wing *Washington Post,* which stated that, because of "this tendency of our allies to be lenient" with GI's who have committed crimes abroad, "Congress ought to express its gratification."

Contacted by HUMAN EVENTS this week, Senator George Malone (R.-Nev.) delivered a devastating rebuttal to these "liberal" apologetics:

"Nothing could demonstrate more clearly how far we have drifted from basic principles," Malone stated, "The question is not: *Will GI's get off with lighter sentences under a court martial or a foreign tribunal?* The question is: *Will Americans be guaranteed the system of justice accorded them as citizens by the United States Constitution?*"

Malone continued: "Our concept of justice is not a matter of 'beating the rap.' It is a matter of principles — of rights and responsibilities as defined by the Constitution. It is no more in harmony with the American Constitution that a citizen escape punishment for a criminal act than it is for a citizen to be deprived of the protections furnished by the Bill of Rights. The 'Status of Forces' agreements, even as characterized by their apologists, are a standing affront to American constitutional principles."

Continued grass-roots protest against the agreements confirms Malone's opposition. In the past week two local draft board officials, Mayor Phil Lightfoot of Tuskegee, Ala., and Samuel Barnes of Olney, Ill., resigned their posts because of the Girard decision. Barnes stated that, if the Government did not protect American soldiers overseas, he could not conscientiously participate in drafting them.

McClellan Committee: Republican members of the McClellan Committee jubilantly claim victory in their campaign to steer it onto the path of Walter Reuther and other leftist-politicking union bosses.

Some Capital observers, accustomed to skepticism in such matters, adopt a "show-me" attitude and defer judgment until they see how the Committee's new procedural ground rules work in actual practice.

GOP committeemen, however, insist that they achieved the substance of what they sought. They concede technical rejection of their proposal to break the committee down into a series of "task forces," each with its own staff investigating a particular type of impropriety.

But they claim the same ultimate aim is attained by promulgation of the list of eleven categories of alleged misdeeds which the committee will probe before it submits a final report some 18 months hence, and assignment of staff investigators to work on each category.

Furthermore, they succeeded in putting a checkrein on the committee's somewhat taciturn, twangy-voiced young counsel, Robert Kennedy. As noted in HUMAN EVENTS last week, a "rebellion from the right" has been growing within the committee for several weeks against Kennedy's obvious distaste for prying into the affairs of any leftist-politicking unions.

His reason is no mystery: he apparently believes that by staying in the good graces of Reuther and his fellow-liberals, he will be enhancing the 1960 Presidential possibilities of his brother, Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts, a member of the committee.

Meeting this week in its first executive business session since May 28 (seven weeks ago), the committee agreed to hold a closed session every Monday to discuss progress and plans. This in itself will restrict Kennedy considerably by providing committeemen a weekly check on what he is doing.

The eleven-category list includes several items which Republicans have been demanding ever since the committee was set up last January: secondary boycotts (which will bring in the Kohler strike, among other things), strike violence (Kohler again), political activities (Reuther and Co.).

Nuclear Nonsense: That the so-called "peace-time" use of nuclear energy is uneconomic; that there should be no expectation it will be otherwise in the foreseeable future ("we are driving a nail with a platinum hammer"); and that placing atomic reactors near large urban centers as we are doing is very dangerous — these were the points made in a HUMAN EVENTS article entitled "Nuclear Nonsense," by David Shea Teeple, on February 11, 1956. Yet, the pretense that such energy is economic, or will soon be so, has been officially kept up; and no official has publicly admitted that reactors are very dangerous — until recently.

Now we find in official hearings just released that one public official has had the temerity to confirm what our article contended. The official is the famous Admiral H. G. Rickover, father of the nuclear-propelled submarine "Nautilus." Rickover is Chief of the Naval Reactors Branch, Atomic Energy Commission, and Chief of the Shippingport power reactor project. He testified March 7 and April 12, 1957, before Subcommittees of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. (So far what he said has not been given any significant attention by the press.) Rickover testified:

(1) The reactor at West Milton, New York, heralded a few years ago as a tremendous achievement for civilian power, is to be shut down because it is a poor financial deal for the Government.

(2) All reactors are going to cost considerably more and take more time to design and construct than was originally estimated — perhaps 50 per cent more.

(3) The Shippingport, Pa., project has already cost $7 million more than estimated and may cost still more before it is finished.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(4) This Shippingport plant, it was originally estimated, could produce electricity for 52 mills per kwh. The present estimate is that it will cost 65 mills. *Power can now be purchased in this area from private companies for less than 5 mills.*

(5) We cannot expect to have an atomic power plant in the foreseeable future which will be competitive with conventional plants.

(6) There are a lot of things that can go wrong with reactors; eternal vigilance is required. An accident could set the whole business back a generation.

One nuclear expert, after perusal of Rickover's testimony, tells HUMAN EVENTS: "It indicates that the hucksters of atomic power have outraced the scientists. The entire Rickover testimony makes the grandiose schemes for international development of atomic power, 'Atoms for Peace,' etc., look pretty silly."

OTC: Dead for this year, is the consensus of members of the House Ways and Means Committee anent the OTC (Organization for Trade Cooperation) authorizing legislation, for which the Administration has been plugging valiantly all year.

This verdict comes in the wake of an abortive attempt by a group of Democratic committee members to open the subject up for public hearings — an attempt seen by colleagues as an obvious move to embarrass GOP members. It failed because the Republicans refused to take the bait, and unabashedly voted against hearings on OTC despite incessant White House pressure for its approval.

The Democratic gesture came in connection with a bill to provide tariff protection for domestic producers of lead and zinc, suffering acutely as a result of the ending of the Government's stockpiling of those metals. The committee had already approved the bill in principle, but decided to hold brief hearings on it late this month before formally reporting it to the House. Then it decided to expand the hearings to include possible revision of the "anti-dumping" law, aimed at preventing foreign countries from "dumping" goods in this country at below-cost prices.

At this point, the Democrats proposed expanding the hearings further to include OTC. They were voted down, however, by more reasonable Democrats and Republicans.

The proposed OTC would administer the highly controversial and highly internationalist General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade — GATT. Opposition has been growing steadily ever since the Eisenhower Administration first proposed it two years ago; critics charge it would lead to even greater cuts in already-slashed U.S. tariff rates.

Defeat for Reuther: The Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, California, handed UAW boss Walter Reuther a stiff defeat last week, as it rescinded a "boycott" resolution aimed at the Kohler plumbing goods company of Kohler, Wis. Los Angeles had adopted the resolution April 19, 1956 — in response to Reuther's "boycott Kohler" vendetta — directing the County purchasing agent to refrain from buying goods from companies "violating Federal labor laws" (Reuther's charge against Kohler).

Chief factor in the rescission was the legal opinion of Los Angeles County Counsel Harold W. Kennedy, who informed the five-man Board of Supervisors that its action of a year ago was illegal under California state law. Kennedy advised the Supervisors that County bidding in California must be free and competitive, and that contracts must be let to the "lowest responsible bidder."

This point was raised by Father Edward A. Keller, discussing the boycott resolutions in HUMAN EVENTS for February 23, 1957 ("Can Reuther's Boycott Bring Kohler to Its Knees?"). "The legality of such ordinances," wrote Father Keller, "is highly questionable, because most states require awarding of a contract to the lowest bidder."

A possible contributing factor in the Board's reversal, believe authoritative sources in California, was the warning sounded by about a dozen companies in the East and Middle West. These firms had declared that, if the boycott remained in effect, they would make no purchases in the Los Angeles area.

Book Event: *Usurpers—Foes of Free Men*, by Hamilton A. Long; Post Printing Co., 18 Beekman Street, New York 38, N.Y.; 114 pp.; $1.00.

That the Federal Government is grasping "vast new powers" without "the consent of the governed," and thus violating the intent of the Constitution, is the thesis of this fully documented brochure by a member of the New York State Bar. In particular, the attempts of the Supreme Court to stand the Constitution on its head receive close examination.

Citing Court decisions and opinions, Mr. Long shows how the limits of the Federal Government's power had been clearly defined by the Supreme Court for generations prior to 1937; with a lawyer's eye he critically analyzes the Court's policy since that date. "Must" reading for those who want a crisp analysis of the root-causes behind our "constitutional crisis."

Letter from ROGER H. FERGER, Editor and Publisher, *The Cincinnati Enquirer*: "The courageous objectivity in the presentation of the news behind the news by HUMAN EVENTS has been invaluable to me and my editorial associates in aiding us to meet our obligation to the readership we serve. HUMAN EVENTS is rendering a distinguished service to the cause of straight-thinking in these perilous times."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED